

asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such a teaching or suggestion appears in the reference" (*In re Rijckaert*, 28 USPQ2d, 1955, 1957). Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claims 3 and 8.

The Examiner rejected claims 4-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dingwall (5,903,246) and Hosokawa (5,142,343) as applied to claims 3 and 8 above, and further in view of Brown (5,184,114). Applicant traverses this rejection.

In rejecting claims 4 and 9 the Examiner admits that Dingwall and Hosokawa do not teach the bonding layer recited in the claim. The Examiner then looks to Brown as teaching a bonding layer. Brown teaches bonding individual chips to electrodes using a conducting epoxy. There is no possibility of the electrodes on one chip being connected to the wrong electrode on the substrate in the system taught in Brown.

If a layer of the adhesive taught in Brown were utilized in the device taught by Dingwall, the drive electrodes of adjacent pixels would be shorted rendering the device inoperative. The present invention avoids these shorts by using an anisotropic adhesive which only conducts electricity in one direction. The above amendments to Claims 4 and 9 emphasize this difference between the present invention and that taught by the combination of references.

In rejecting claims 5 and 10, the Examiner stated that Brown discloses said bonding layer comprises electrically conducting particles suspended in an electrically insulating adhesive. Applicant can find no such teaching in Brown. Brown merely refers to an electrically conducting epoxy. To make an anisotropic conducting adhesive, one needs compressible particles. The above amendments to Claims 5 and 10 make this clear and further differentiate the present invention from that taught by the combination of the cited references.

In rejecting claims 6 and 11, the Examiner stated that Dingwall discloses a light conversion layer consisting of the color shutters mentioned in Dingwall. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Dingwall.



While Dingwall refers to “shutters”, these are not light conversion shutters that absorb light of one wavelength and emit light of a second wavelength. The material cited by the Examiner makes no mention of color conversion. Dingwall refers to integrating color shutters. These are devices that switch between a transparent mode and an opaque mode and hence can be used to select the total energy output by any given pixel. Such shutters provide a means of modulating the intensity of light received by the viewer from the corresponding pixel on the display.

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any others attached hereto) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date signed below in an envelope addressed to: Hon. Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Box Amendment, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Calvin B. Ward".

Calvin B. Ward
Registration No. 30,896
Date signed and mailed: 3/22/00

Agilent Technologies
Legal Dept., M/S 51UPD
P.O. Box 58043
Santa Clara, CA 95052-8043
Telephone (925) 855-0413
Telefax (925) 855-9214